

M - 241,712

S 555,905  
MAR 23 1969

# China Policy Leads to Split Among Scholars

By CROCKER SNOW JR.

Staff writer

A radical group of young Asian scholars is planning a symbolic "breakaway" from the prestigious Association for Asian Studies during its annual conference scheduled in Boston next week-end.

Dramatizing their opposition to U.S. policy towards mainland China, four members of the group including three Harvard graduate students met with Communist Chinese diplomats in Paris just a month ago.

They presented a statement to the Chinese Embassy there declaring that the problem with Sino-American relations is "not the 'containment' of China, but what to do about the expansion of the United States."

The group organized a year ago as the Committee for Concerned Asian Scholars after holding a "vietnam Caucus" during the association's annual conference in Philadelphia.

C.C.A.S. counts about 100 Asian scholars around the country as members, with its largest and most active chapter at Harvard.

It will hold its own conference in Boston this Friday, Saturday and Sunday in competition with the formal three-day meeting of the Association for Asian Studies planned at the Sheraton Boston.

The A.A.S. is the foremost professional organization of Asian experts in the country and includes such figures as Edwin O. Reischauer and John King Fairbank of Harvard and A. Doak Barnett and C. Martin Wilbur of Co-

But the new radical committee feels that the A.A.S. and its established scholars simply reinforce unjust U.S. policies towards China.

"Since 1945, there has been a circular flow of academics, military specialists, CIA agents, State Department officials, and others, linking the academic world to the U.S. government," the C.C.A.S. charges.

"Harvard's East Asian Research Center, for example, invites CIA personnel to 'study' China on campus, and most East Asian departments are eager to channel their graduates into government service."

To emphasize their point of view, four members of the committee went to Paris last month and initiated a meeting with Communist Chinese officials there Feb. 20, the day official United States-China diplomatic talks were to re-open in Warsaw, Poland.

Harvard graduate students Thomas Engelhardt, John Livingston and Cheryl P. Goodman and Neale Hunter, an Australian recently arrived in America from teaching English in Peking, had two meetings at the Chinese Embassy, Feb. 20 and 22.

They said their trip demonstrated that "contacts are possible between ordinary American citizens and the People's Republic of China, despite the present position of the U.S. government."

In their written statement to the Communist diplomats, they made two proposals for improving U.S.-China relations: (1) an end to United States containment of China by the withdrawal of American military forces from bases in South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, Thailand, and the Philippines, and (2) United States recognition of Taiwan as an integral part of mainland China.

The students reported that the Chinese officials in Paris responded to the C.C.A.S. statement as "objective and accurately reflecting both the hostility of U.S. policy toward China and what must be done to improve relations."

C.C.A.S. organizers are planning to use the occasion of the Association for Asian Studies annual meeting to draw attention to their more radical outlook on American policies in the Far East. The A.A.S. has scheduled a series of speeches and panel discussions at the Sheraton Boston for three full days beginning this Friday.

As a splinter group of sorts, the C.C.A.S. will hold simultaneous meetings in the neighboring Lenox in an effort to attract some of the more than 2000 Asian scholars expected to attend the A.A.S. meeting.

One panel has been set up jointly by the two groups, a Saturday afternoon discussion about some of the origins of U.S. government hostility toward Communist China featuring Richard Kagan of the University of Pennsylvania, O. Edmund Clubb of Columbia, Ross Koen of the California State Teachers Assn., Howard Zinn of B.U. and Owen Latimer of the University in England.

Org. 1 Committee for  
Concerned Asian  
Scholars

Org. 1. Association for Asian  
Studies

C.I.A. 4.01 Colleges and Universities  
(Harvard)

*Res Wicker, Thomas*  
*only document for Asian*  
*Studies*

## All the Handouts Fit to Print

To the editors of the New York Times, the story obviously seemed significant. It began with more than half a column on the front page and carried over to a full page inside. Written by Times Washington Bureau Chief Tom Wicker, the piece was based on a handout: a statement calling for a more liberalized U.S. policy toward Communist China, including eventual diplomatic recognition and admission to the United Nations. Wicker emphasized that the statement had been signed by "198 academic experts on China," all of whom belong to the Association for Asian Studies. Happy to have so many experts agreeing with its own position, the Times applauded in an editorial: "The statement on China by 198 Asian scholars—opposed by only 19 other members of the Association for Asian Studies—shows where the weight of informed American opinion lies."

**Signers in Dispute.** All of which goes to illustrate the danger of making too much of handouts. In a letter published by the Times last week, Wm. Theodore de Bary, a member of the Association for Asian Studies and Chairman of the Department of Chinese and Japanese at Columbia University, explained that the signers are only a fraction of the association's 3,374 members. "Since it is a policy of the Association not to take a stand or conduct a vote on political questions," wrote De Bary, "no person or group can claim to represent the membership. Signers of the statement must have been unaware such a construction would be put upon it by those presenting it to the Times."

The association's national secretary, L. A. Peter Gosling, associate profes-



TIMESMAN TOM WICKER  
*Much ado about nothing.*

sor of geography at the University of Michigan, was even blunter. Calling Wicker's article "factually inaccurate," Gosling estimated that only one-third of the signers could be considered China experts. By paying \$15-a-year dues, anyone who demonstrates an interest in Asia can join the association; members range from anthropologists to theologians to librarians. Moreover, charged Gosling, some of the signers do not belong to the association; nor was the entire membership contacted and given a chance to sign the paper. "It was disorganized," says Gosling. "They sent letters to people they knew who shared similar views, and these people sent the material on to others who generally were in agreement."

The drafters of the document—Harold Taylor, onetime president of Sarah Lawrence College, and Betty Goetz Lall, of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations—deny any such intent. As the leaders of the Manhattan-based National Research Council on Peace Strategy, which issues statements on foreign policy, they feel that

they consulted enough China scholars on the wording of their paper, and that they circulated it sufficiently. No other U.S. newspaper, however, shared the Times's enthusiasm for the document. If they ran anything on it at all, most papers carried a much shorter Associated Press story that coupled the scholars' recommendations with similar ones made by Senator Fulbright. Even many of the papers that subscribe to the New York Times News Service ran the A.P. version.

**Acute Scholaritis.** "I and the New York Times," says Wicker, "thought and still think the document was a considerable contribution to debate on the subject." He attributed the complaints to what he calls the "China lobby." But the fact is that the criticism came from all quarters. In his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, David Nelson Rowe, political science professor at Yale, charged the Times with "at the very least a gross distortion of the meaning of the statistics. Such are the distortions of propagandistic journalism." The liberal *Reporter* magazine editorialized: "The Times built the release into major significance by giving it inordinate prominence and a largely spurious authority. This is not just an acute case of 'scholaritis'; this is irresponsible journalism."

### 3 China Scholars Voice Dissent On Relaxing Stance on Peking

Three prominent Asia scholars disagreed yesterday with the policy statement on China signed by 108 other members of the Association for Asian Studies and made public in Washington.

The three, who generally opposed relaxing America's stance toward China, are among 19 association members who registered their objections with the statement's circulators.

Most of the dissenters disagreed only with some of the recommendations contained in the document. But Prof. Frank N. Trager of New York University, former Ambassador Stanley K. Hornbeck and A. Sabin Chase, a former State Department expert, took exception to most or all of the document.

#### Hitler Actions Cited

Professor Trager, who teaches graduate courses in Southeast Asian affairs and in national security policy, explained that he was in favor of "isolating China as much as possible."

"I would welcome all kinds of economic measures that would embarrass her present leadership even to the extent of preclusive buying on soft-good imports and food grains," he said.

In a telephone interview, Professor Trager added:

"The opponents of the view I hold believe that by being nice to the Chinese Communists you can woo and win them. This is equivalent to those in the Thirties who said 'Let's be nice to Hitler and he'll be a good boy.'"

Mr. Hornbeck, who specialized in Far Eastern affairs during

most of his 26-year career in the State Department, particularly disagreed with the document's position on diplomatic recognition for Communist China.

"You can't maintain the relations we have with Taiwan, with the Republic of China, and establish them with the People's Republic on the mainland in the attitude that they are in," he said. "This is a proposal of the impossible. You can't do those two things at the same time."

The retired diplomat added that he believed the writers and circulators of the memorandum "had not done their homework fully; they did not understand their subject fully."

#### Objections Detailed

Mr. Chase, who served in the Far Eastern section of the State Department and as political counselor of the embassy in Manila before his retirement in 1957, explained that he did not "go along with most of the recommendations" contained in the document.

At the end of a long letter detailing his specific objections to the memorandum's authors, he wrote of China:

"The stakes are far too high to ignore a challenge which, not withstood, is in large part bluster; but too long indulged, could become far more lethal."

Of the 16 others who formally registered their refusal to sign the document, many advocated a more specific statement about the future status of Taiwan, according to Mrs. Betty Goetz Lall, one of the coordinators of the memorandum.

*Pres Chase, A. Sabin  
Pres Trager, Frank N.  
Pres Hornbeck, Stanley K.  
Goetz-Lall, Betty Lall  
Orig. Pres. for Asian  
Studies*